

State of California
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE

Draft Minutes of Meeting
September 3, 2015

Caltrans District 11
4050 Taylor Street
Garcia Auditorium 1-125
San Diego, California 92110

Committee Members in Attendance:

Hamid Bahadori, Chairman
Mark Greenwood, Vice Chairman
Chris Engelmann, Committee Secretary
Scott Baland
David Fleisch
Daniel Gutierrez
Bryan Jones
Rick Marshall
Emma Olenberger
Duper Tong
Jay Walter
William Winter

Committee Staff:

Don Howe, Chief, Signs Branch, Office of Traffic Engineering
Vijay Taloda, Transportation Engineer

Also Present:

Bob Bronkall, Humboldt County Public Works
Chad Dornsife, National Motorists Association
Jeff Hitch, Public Works Construction Manager at City of Murrieta
Jonathan Ingram, Murrieta City Council Member
Michael Kenney, Principal Traffic Engineer, Chen Ryan Associates
Bryant King, concerned citizen
Kevin Korth, U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration
Conrad Lapinsky, Traffic Engineer, City of Dana Point
Josh Reese, District 11 Signal Operations
Jon Sanchez, Intern, Chen Ryan Associates
Claude Strayer, Associate Transportation Engineer, KOA Corporation

ORGANIZATION ITEMS

1. Introduction

Kyle Nelson, the San Diego location P.A./sound man, opened the meeting with housekeeping announcements.

Chair Bahadori called the meeting of the California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC) to order at 9:03 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of the June 4, 2015 Meeting

MOTION: Committee Member Walter moved to approve the June 4, 2015 California Traffic Control Devices Committee Meeting Minutes as presented. Committee Member Winter seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Membership

a. Dan Gutierrez

New Committee Member Dan Gutierrez has been training Caltrans professionals in bicycle transportation.

b. Lt. Scott Baland

New Committee Member Lt. Scott Baland of the CHP Special Projects Section replaces Lt. Dave Ricks.

c. David Fleisch

New Committee Member David Fleisch is the Transportation Department Director for Ventura County.

d. Vacancy for alternate non-motorized representative

Committee Member Tong introduced Chris Engelmann, who has accepted a position as Senior Transportation Engineer with Caltrans. He is also the Editor and of the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD) and Executive Secretary of the CTCDC.

Chair Bahadori requested recognition at the next Sacramento meeting for former CTCDC Secretary Devinder Singh and former Committee Member John Ciccarelli.

Chair Bahadori invited the CTCDC members and audience to introduce themselves.

Committee Secretary Engelmann announced that two items would be removed from the Agenda:

15-18 Proposal for street names for bridges over paths and at path intersections

15-21 Proposal to remove International Symbol of Accessibility (ISA) from Figure 3B-22(CA)

4. Public Comment

Michael Kenney, Principal Traffic Engineer, Chen Ryan Associates, sought clarification on Interim Approval 16, Bicycle Signal Face. As they are in the exploratory phase, they sought more information on two issues:

1. The 3' separation between signal heads on the same approach (with a left turn phase and a bicycle phase). The separation is difficult to achieve on a pole.

2. A bicycle may make a right turn immediately into adjacent vehicle traffic. This is not intuitive, but a green bicycle steady symbol allows any movement, as shown distinctly in Interim Approval 16-2.

Mr. Kenney requested the committee to pass along any better information and any timeline for when the issues will be addressed.

Committee Secretary Engelmann responded that he will be looking into the issues.

5. Items under Experimentation

AGENDA ITEMS

6. Public Hearing

CONSENT ITEMS (minor discussion with vote expected)

There were no Consent Items discussed at this time.

INFORMATION ITEMS (new items that may be voted on or brought back as an Action Item in a future meeting)

Agenda Item 15-15: Proposal for striping a space for bicycle use at locations with right-turn-only lanes

Committee Secretary Engelmann pointed out that the recently revised Highway Design Manual (HDM) added language explaining that in locations that are not Class 2 bicycle facilities, there should be a 4' width for bicycle use between a right-turn lane and a through lane. The MUTCD does not provide guidance on this concept, so Committee Secretary Engelmann referred to a draft example concept of what could be used. An edge line could be added to the left of the 8" line; Committee Secretary Engelmann proposed to use two 8" lines to define the separation. Some text could also be inserted in the new section 9C of .102.

Chair Bahadori asked if this issue is addressed in Chapter 100 also. Committee Secretary Engelmann replied that Chapter 100 is broken up with information placed in different sections of the HDM.

Committee Member Questions

Committee Member Gutierrez asked if any kind of indicative marking would be put into the bicycle space – it is not a bicycle lane. Committee Secretary Engelmann responded that typically the markings on the pavement supplement signage. It may not be appropriate to have a bike lane that is 100' long. Much depends on how it is going to be used (based on local Bicycle Master Plans, perhaps).

Committee Member Gutierrez suggested to consider the option of using the bike lane symbol, but not the word marking "BIKE LANE". Committee Members Winter and Jones concurred.

Committee Member Jones suggested that if there is a shoulder, the space for the bike lane area could be used. Often when Caltrans designs roadways, the 4' or 8' shoulder is used for breakdown vehicles – conflicts occur at the intersections. Caltrans does have a goal of tripling biking by 2020.

Committee Member Gutierrez agreed: taking the space from the right side shoulder and using it for bicycles is a better use.

Committee Member Greenwood countered that Caltrans recently spent hundreds of millions of dollars widening shoulders due to severe liability concerns. He did not think the problem is as simple as narrowing the shoulders at intersections; intersections are where all accidents happen, including vehicle accidents.

Committee Member Greenwood also questioned the last sentence. Committee Secretary Engelmann explained that in one of their districts, bicyclists had indicated that 4' was not enough space for them to want to use. Other guidelines prefer a wider space when there is adjacent higher-speed traffic. Committee Member Gutierrez noted that Topic 302 in the HDM discusses making the bike lanes wider on high-speed roads using similar wording.

Public Comment

There was no Public Comment.

Committee Member Discussion

Committee Secretary Engelmann stated that today the item was an Information Item not necessitating a vote. He also wanted to have the CBAC consider the item.

Agenda Item 15-16: Proposal to re-insert 3 sec minimum yellow change interval for protected left or right turns

Chair Bahadori stated that he had received calls from CHP and others – as Caltrans is nearing the compliance date for yellow timings for the intersections that have red light cameras, they noticed that the last MUTCD revision neglected to mention the minimum 3 seconds. The CTCDC thought that re-insertion of the verbiage in one place would be a good idea for clarification.

Committee Secretary Engelmann felt that this particular sentence had been inadvertently left out. The Engineering Judgment for 3 seconds needs to apply here; that may include driving the left turn pocket to see what the approach speeds are, and basing the timing accordingly. Signal controllers will not accept times of less than 3 seconds for state highways.

Chair Bahadori explained for the new members that the committee had already conducted two lengthy debates on the issue of minimum yellow timing. The committee could not reach a consensus regarding a methodology or a table other than the minimum 3 seconds. At this time, the discussion was just to reinsert the 3 second verbiage.

Committee Member Questions

Committee Member Winter recalled that the reason the committee had struggled a bit was the wording. They thought that some practitioners may assign 3 seconds without considering the other factors. He suggested adding Table 4D to this section – it includes some footnotes to consider.

Committee Member Walter agreed that the Engineering Judgment is important in this determination. He recommended leaving out the 3 second figure and instead referencing the table.

Chair Bahadori outlined the options for the committee. Committee Member Winter mentioned the range of variables when someone is making a left turn, including the dimension of the pocket itself and the degree of curve of the turn. The subcommittee had decided that it was up to the engineer's judgment on how to determine speed.

Chair Bahadori suggested refraining from referring to speed, and instead referring to field conditions, in addition to the minimum 3 seconds.

Committee Member Jones commented that paragraph 14 at the Guidance already states “between 3 and 6”, making 14D somewhat redundant.

Committee Secretary Engelmann requested a vote for today, as the red light camera deadline had already passed.

Public Comment

Chad Dornsife of the National Motorist Association and the Best Highway Safety Practices Institute strongly recommended a clause in the language referring to “conditions found” or “conditions present”, as opposed to the flat “3 seconds” which is being broadly misused in many areas.

Kevin Korth of the Federal Highway Administration recommended against inserting any lengthy descriptor, including referring to the Engineering Judgment. Providing a value of 3 to start from is a standard statement; from there the engineering comes in. Mr. Korth recommended being careful about inserting much more standard language with the value statement.

Committee Member Discussion

Committee Member Marshall suggested moving the second version of paragraph 14B (displayed on the screen) to go first – with the effect of prioritizing it with details following. Committee Member Winter agreed.

MOTION for Item 15-16: Committee Member Winter moved not to add the text displayed on the screen in red, and to move the Guidance Statement up to paragraph 14, collapsing it together with the 3-6 second minimum and maximum Guidance Statement. Committee Member Marshall seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

At that time Chair Bahadori suggested to address Item 12-10 at the request of the City of Murrieta. There were no objections.

Agenda Item 12-10: Request to use directional signage for Veteran Memorial Monuments

Chair Bahadori stated that the request was submitted by the City of Murrieta and was sponsored by Caltrans.

Committee Secretary Engelmann stated that this agenda item had not earned enough votes to pass in 2012. Since then, the City of Murrieta had requested to revisit the item, in order to examine the definition of *memorial monument*.

Jeff Hitch, Construction Manager for the City of Murrieta, played a video to give perspective on the Veterans Memorial Monument. He explained its significance and described its location.

Jonathan Ingram, Murrieta City Council Member, pointed out that this is a regional memorial – but many people do not know that it exists and do not know how to find it.

Chair Bahadori stated that when this item came before the committee in 2012, there had been two concerns. criteria for memorials was needed, and other signs were already in existence that could be used.

Mr. Ingram stressed the importance of the location as evidenced by the attendance at a recent funeral procession for a fallen soldier.

Public Comment

Massoud Saberian of the City of Santa Rosa spoke of the Korean Veterans Memorial in Oregon with a white on brown color scheme.

Committee Member Questions

Committee Member Greenwood asked if Caltrans supported the request; Committee Secretary Engelmann responded that it did under certain conditions. Committee Member Greenwood then referenced MUTCD G86-11 regarding historic markers; the Veterans Memorial is clearly a historic marker. Chair Bahadori replied that they needed to ensure that the Veterans Memorial was allowed under the definition of a historic site.

Mr. Howe stated that in responding to the 2011 request, Caltrans had identified criteria in the table for Supplemental Destination Signs. The committee's concern had been that the policy for monuments was not very specific; they felt that they could support the request as long as they had some criteria. Mr. Howe noted that Guidance in the MUTCD states that not more than one supplemental guide sign should be used on each interchange approach.

Chair Bahadori expressed concern about the formal qualification of the Veterans Memorial as a historic site.

Committee Member Marshall asked how this item had returned to the committee without having a completed Action Item that addressed the original concerns about criteria. Chair Bahadori explained that the committee thought the issue had died; while they supported the idea, criteria was needed to prevent the proliferation of such signs.

Committee Member Jones expressed dismay that the situation had continued since 2011 – veterans should be honored which includes having a sign for their monuments. The committee needs to create some criteria. The 215/15 corridor is very busy with travelers between Riverside and San Diego County. With 25% of San Diego County's residents military-based, they need to be able to see this sign.

Committee Member Gutierrez referenced sections 19A and 19B. He asked if the concern is that local agencies would frivolously pass resolutions for signs in peoples' yards – that is not very likely. Section 19B does address the issue of weeding out frivolous requests for such signage.

Committee Secretary Engelmann said that previously, the problem was defining "veteran". He suggested the term "military veteran".

Mr. Ingram stated that Murrieta already has signage limitations for the corridors. He expressed frustration with the layers of bureaucracy they have had to contend with for these four years.

Committee Member Olenberger suggested for the committee to move to allow the sign – the committee can then develop its criteria in a speedy manner. To hold up the request is embarrassing.

Committee Member Walter commented that he had been a Caltrans Traffic Engineer for a number of years and had indeed seen agencies putting forth requests with signed resolutions from the councils that did not meet the criteria. However, in this category, with the ever-

increasing recognition of veterans serving our country, it is important for this committee to establish the criteria quickly.

Referencing Table 2D-102, Committee Member Marshall asked if the City of Murrieta had estimated attendance at the monument via an EIR, negative declaration, or some sort of process. Mr. Hitch responded that attendance may have been identified in the General Plan EIR. Attendance would not be difficult to identify via news documentation of the site.

Committee Member Walter suggested adding verbiage to the table: "Monuments that expect at least 2,000 minimum attendance at events do qualify for this kind of signage."

Mr. Ingram stated that the facility is used not only for educational purposes; there are multiple memorial events happening throughout the year. It is heartbreaking that people in Riverside County do not know that it exists as they drive the corridors.

Chair Bahadori pointed out that the county staff would have to go through the Caltrans encroachment permitting process, of which CTCDC is not a part.

Committee Member Greenwood noted that Caltrans has already provided some guidance on how this sign could work. He hoped that the motion today would be to approve veterans memorial signing in general, and to direct the request that Caltrans fully develop the criteria, bringing it back to the next meeting. Chair Bahadori agreed with this approach.

Committee Member Walter asked for clarification on attendance: how many times has the memorial had attendance in the 2,000 range, where people really would need signage so they could find the facility?

Mr. Ingram responded that his concern was that people in the community would like others to know where to go, by means of a sign, for funerals or events. Situated between March and Pendleton, Murrieta is in the midst of a large military community.

Committee Member Jones asked about guide signs once a person exits the freeway. Mr. Hitch answered that the intention is to match signs on the freeway with signs on the streets, making a contiguous route.

Committee Member Jones offered supplemental wording. He was not in favor of tying attendance numbers to the wording. He felt that the City of Murrieta should adopt some kind of a resolution, and that the city should be in charge of maintaining their monument signs.

Mr. Ingram felt that maintenance would not be an issue. He also suggested stipulating a square footage requirement for veterans memorials.

Committee Member Tong stated that his office would act immediately on any proposal from the city. He offered to share a framework proposal with the city.

Committee Secretary Engelmann felt that square footage would be something to think about – it is easier to track than attendance. The property must be public and ADA-compliant; Mr. Ingram assured him it was. He preferred to have it stated a "military veteran monument". He outlined the Caltrans permit process policy of having trailblazing signs on local streets already in place.

Committee Member Tong suggested the sentence, "Signs shall be provided for publically-owned property only," and agreed that a resolution by the city should authorize the sign.

Committee Member Jones suggested a minimum of 6,000 square feet of land with public access.

Mr. Hitch suggested a requirement for adequate parking. Committee Member Jones stated that minimum or maximum parking is now covered in CEQA.

Chair Bahadori summarized the suggested Guidance Principles: publically owned, public property, recognition by the municipality in a resolution, minimum acreage or square footage, ADA-compliant.

MOTION for Item 12-10: Committee Member Jones moved for the CTCDC to direct Caltrans to create the criteria and put it in place. Committee Member Greenwood seconded.

Committee Member Discussion

Committee Member Walter said that a Friendly Amendment would be that the local agency must have its trailblazing signs in place when it requests the permit.

Chair Bahadori stated that the committee seemed to agree on all the criteria except the size requirement of the facility.

Mr. Ingram spoke of an upcoming 9/11 event; Committee Member Walter suggested for him to obtain a permit from Caltrans to rent signage from a traffic control company.

Mr. Ingram asked how long the process for permanent signage would take. Committee Member Tong responded that the MUTCD would allow the city to use a portable CMS sign for the special event – the District 8 Traffic Management Team would work with him. For the permanent sign, the committee would work with the team to devise the language, and bring it to the December meeting for approval. The manual could be updated in early November. Thus the permanent change should be accomplished in a few months.

Committee Secretary Engelmann requested to include Committee Member Jones' suggestion for paragraph 19A in the motion.

Committee Member Walter requested for staff to bring the language back to the committee at the December meeting, so they could see how it has turned out.

Mr. Ingram asked about the colors for the trailblazing signs. Mr. Howe replied that typically destination signs are white on green; however, the MUTCD directs that culturally significant signs should be white on brown.

Committee Member Greenwood asked that Caltrans and Murrieta staff work out such details.

Committee Member Jones confirmed that the committee was not asking the City of Murrieta staff to come back to the committee for approval, but to share information on what they had decided.

VOTE on the MOTION: Motion carried unanimously.

Agenda Item 15-17: Information on definition of intersections and unmarked crosswalks

Committee Secretary Engelmann stated that this item had come up in response to Caltrans discussion on revision of the ADA Guidelines for wheelchair ramps. He requested feedback from the committee on marked and unmarked crosswalks at T-intersections, rural intersections and regular intersections, which he illustrated with some diagrams.

Committee Member Jones ascertained with Committee Secretary Engelmann that Caltrans does still have the goal of doubling pedestrian traffic by 2020.

Committee Members Jones and Tong felt that the committee should be looking for ways to facilitate pedestrians crossing intersections, such as painted and landscaped medians – they make connections for people wanting to cross from one side to the other. Caltrans should be leading the way for everyone, including those who have mobility challenges.

Committee Member Marshall felt that with all the variations among intersections, the committee's decisions should be driven by the land uses served and the paths of demand – the pedestrians' purposes – and less by the street configurations.

Chair Bahadori stressed the need for handicapped access ramps at all crossing points. However, at landscaped medians this is not possible; there are many field variables.

Committee Secretary Engelmann stated that if pedestrians are using an intersection, they should be provided for. Committee Member Tong agreed with Committee Member Jones that pedestrians should not have to make a long detour to cross the street; engineers should use an Engineering Judgment to provide the most convenient and direct pathway.

Committee Member Gutierrez pointed out that technical definition of “unmarked crosswalk” must be clear. Clear definitions will allow Engineering Judgments for deciding what configurations of street furniture to use while allowing pedestrian facilities.

Committee Member Jones noted that Caltrans has provided miles of 8' shoulders for car breakdowns. Caltrans should be exploring using raised refuge islands; we should not treat pedestrians as third-class citizens compared to motorists. Directional ramps are a good approach, rather than ramps angling out into an intersection.

Committee Member Winter took the approach that a crosswalk's purpose is to help motorists discern whether they should yield for pedestrians. The questions should be, What is generating pedestrian volumes? and What is a proper treatment to deal with it? Then you derive an ADA treatment. Committee Member Winter did not see this Agenda Item as needing any kind of a manual change. Engineering Judgments come into play, and the manual covers engineering philosophy. When the ADA component comes into the mix you can still make reasonable decisions.

Committee Member Jones commented that we often leave it up to Engineering Judgments, and sometimes the engineering prioritizes the mode of transportation. Traffic engineers may take out a crosswalk to enhance the level of service for motorists at an intersection; then the pedestrian has to cross three legs of the intersection.

Chair Bahadori commented on the number of different variables; it is a complex issue to be looking for legislative change. The primary goal should be to promote pedestrian safety.

Committee Member Walter commented that when putting in ADA ramps at corners, perhaps better direction could be given and better decisions could be made at the local level, to prioritize those areas of crossing based on safety and demand.

Committee Secretary Engelmann clarified that Caltrans' intent was not to change definitions or implement new legislation; they were only seeking feedback.

Agenda Item 15-19: Information on use of red markers on off-ramps

Committee Secretary Engelmann stated that the item had been initiated due to a number of wrong-way crashes in the Sacramento and San Diego areas during the last six months. Caltrans has received pressure from the media to take some kind of action. Committee Member Tong added that legislative action has been taken to study the wrong-way crashes.

Committee Secretary Engelmann continued that one of the districts looked at the possible use of reflective red pavement markers on offramps, not just freeways, to alert wrong-way drivers. Caltrans is looking at other measures including modernized detection systems that can notify traffic management centers of wrong-way drivers immediately.

Committee Secretary Engelmann stated that his report today was informational. He expected to come back to the committee to look at future proposals. He pointed out that the underlying problem in this issue is DUI.

Committee Member Questions

Committee Member Greenwood asked if Caltrans had gotten away from using the red clear marker on the main line. Committee Member Tong replied that Caltrans places one every half mile.

Committee Member Greenwood asked about the yellow/red marker. Committee Secretary Engelmann responded that it is available now and is used on the left edge line to the main line.

Committee Member Tong clarified that spikes are intended for parking lots or stopping booth situations with vehicle speeds of about 5 MPH.

Committee Member Gutierrez suggested the use of Public Service Announcements so that people understand what the red markers mean.

Public Comment

Mr. Dornsife stated that he is involved in the manufacture of roadway delineation. That industry has made many presentations to Caltrans. Standard reflectors lose a significant amount of ability to guide traffic after 10-15 months – they decrease to zero reflectivity unless illuminated by headlights. The MUTCD does allow internally illuminated devices, but there is very little guidance; they want people to experiment with them.

Mr. Dornsife continued that if Caltrans has a mandate to take action, there are methodologies to be looked at and tested – technologies are being used around the world for a myriad of reasons.

Committee Member Discussion

Committee Member Winter asked if AB 162 was the legislation on this topic. Committee Member Tong confirmed, and said that Caltrans would refresh the study this December, and in 2016 would produce a follow-up report intended to show test results.

Committee Member Walter confirmed with Committee Secretary Engelmann that one of the items currently under experimentation is the red in-pavement lights at stop bars. He suggested that at ramp entrances with crosswalks, in-pavement lights could be installed on the back side of the line. Chair Bahadori commented on the expense of that solution.

Committee Secretary Engelmann pointed out that in Sacramento, not all of the collisions were initiated through offramps; in some, the driver simply crossed the median and kept driving.

Agenda Item 15-20: Proposal to modify Section 2B.55 Photo Enforced Signs and Plaques

Committee Secretary Engelmann stated that this issue was discovered in the 2014 MUTCD. In the past, local agencies could place a Photo Enforced sign on the city's perimeter, identifying new intersections that use photo enforcement. In the 2015 Vehicle Code (21455.5), this was changed: signs must be placed 200' prior to intersections where such a system is being utilized.

Committee Secretary Engelmann showed a proposed change in the text to reflect the Vehicle Code.

MOTION: Committee Member Marshall moved to approve the request to modify Section 2B.55 of the MUTCD. Committee Member Greenwood seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Action Items (continuing discussion from prior meetings with vote expected)

There were no Action Items.

Tabled Items

Agenda Item 15-11: Proposed Near-Term Revisions to Existing CA MUTCD Guidance on Bicycle Signals

7. Request for Experimentation

There were no Requests for Experimentation.

8. Discussion Items

There were no Discussion Items.

9. Next Meeting

Chair Bahadori announced that the next meeting is scheduled for December 10 at the Caltrans Headquarters in Sacramento.

10. Adjourn

Chair Bahadori adjourned the meeting at 12:01 p.m.